

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated October 6, 2003, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 29, 32, 35, and 38 have been cancelled.
Claims 1-18, 27, 28, 36 and 37 are pending.

In response to the objection in sections 5 and 6 of the action, the typographical error noted in claim 7 has been corrected and claims 29, 32, 35 and 38 have been cancelled.

In response to the formal rejection, the claims have been amended to eliminate the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is requested that the objection and formal rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Armstrong is respectfully traversed for the reason that the novel input device defined in claim 1 is not disclosed in the applied reference.

The applied reference discloses a manually activated input device for controlling motions of a multipart object,

using a force-moment sensor. Detected movements are converted to similar actions of the object as a whole. However, this reference does not disclose essential features that are recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Specifically, the applied reference does not disclose the following limitations in claim 1:

the commanded individual linear displacements and/or rotational excursions of the force/moment sensor are assigned specific kinematic motion patterns of parts of the real or virtual object thereby permitting manipulation or animation thereof as a transforming interlink and in that the commanded velocities of the corresponding individual linear displacements and/or rotational excursions of the force/moment sensor are additionally weightable as a kinematic interlink assignment.

In this regard, it is noted that the explanation of the rejection does not contain any discussion of these claim limitations.

The fact is that the reference does not teach that commanded velocities of the respective linear displacements and/or rotational excursions of the force/movement sensor can be used for a kinematic interlink assignment of the real or virtual multipart object. Thus, for example, according to the invention, a slow upward movement of the grip of the force/moment sensor in the positive Z direction can result in a kinematic interlink assignment that involves an upward

movement of the arms of a simulated animated human figure constituting the multipart object, as shown in figure 2 of the application drawing. On the other hand, a quick upward movement of the grip can result in an assignment that involves a jumping motion of the simulated animated human figure, as shown in figures 3 and 4. Such operations are not within the capabilities of the systems disclosed in the applied reference.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 as anticipated by Armstrong be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejections of the dependant claims as unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Walker or Dietrich are respectfully traversed on the grounds that all of these claims depend from claim 1 and should therefore be considered allowable along therewith.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the prior art rejection of record be reconsidered and withdrawn, that all of the pending claims be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.


Appln. No. 09/883,366
Amd. dated February 4, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2003

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By


Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:mch
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\K\Kirb\Gombert4\PTO\AMD 4 FEB 04.doc